1	EDMUND G. BROWN JR., Attorney General		
2	of the State of California PAUL C. AMENT		
3	Supervising Deputy Attorney General E. A. JONES III, State Bar No. 71375		
4	Deputy Attorney General ELAINE GYURKO Sonian Local Analyst		
5	Senior Legal Analyst California Department of Justice		
6	300 So. Spring Street, Suite 1702 Los Angeles, California 90013		
7	Telephone: (213) 897-4944 Facsimile: (213) 897-9395		
8	Attorneys for Complainant		
9	BEFORE THE RESPIRATORY CARE BOARD		
10	DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS STATE OF CALIFORNIA		
11	STATE OF CALIFORNIA		
12	In the Matter of the Accusation Against:	Case No. 1H 2006 188	
13	KAREN LOUISE PARKER	ACCUSATION	
14	4832 Hayter Avenue Lakewood, California 90712		
15	Respiratory Care Practitioner License No. 19360		
16	Respondent.		
17			
18	Complainant alleges:		
19	<u>PARTIES</u>		
20	1. Stephanie Nunez (Complainant) brings this Accusation solely in her		
21	official capacity as the Executive Officer of the Respiratory Care Board of California,		
22	Department of Consumer Affairs (Board).		
23	2. On or about April 14, 1997, the Board issued Respiratory Care Practitioner		
24	License Number 19360 to Karen Louise Parker (Respondent). This license was in full force and		
25	effect at all times relevant to the charges brought herein and will expire on May 31, 2010, unless		
26	renewed.		
27	//		
28	//		
	_		

## **JURISDICTION**

- 3. This Accusation is brought before the Board under the authority of the following laws. All section references are to the Business and Professions Code (Code) unless otherwise indicated.
- 4. Section 3710 of the Code states: "The Respiratory Care Board of California, hereafter referred to as the board, shall enforce and administer this chapter [Chapter 8.3, the Respiratory Care Practice Act]."
- 5. Section 3718 of the Code states: "The board shall issue, deny, suspend, and revoke licenses to practice respiratory care as provided in this chapter."
  - 6. Section 3750 of the Code states:

"The board may order the denial, suspension or revocation of, or the imposition of probationary conditions upon, a license issued under this chapter, for any of the following causes:

٠. . .

"(d) Conviction of a crime that substantially relates to the qualifications, functions, or duties of a respiratory care practitioner. The record of conviction or a certified copy thereof shall be conclusive evidence of the conviction.

"

"(j) The commission of any fraudulent, dishonest, or corrupt act which is substantially related to the qualifications, functions, or duties of a respiratory care practitioner.

" "

7. Section 3752 of the Code states:

"A plea or verdict of guilty or a conviction following a plea of nolo contendere made to a charge of any offense which substantially relates to the qualifications, functions, or duties of a respiratory care practitioner is deemed to be a conviction within the meaning of this article. The board shall order the license suspended or revoked, or may decline to issue a license, when the time for appeal has elapsed, or the judgment of

conviction has been affirmed on appeal or when an order granting probation is made suspending the imposition of sentence, irrespective of a subsequent order under Section 1203.4 of the Penal Code allowing the person to withdraw his or her plea of guilty and to enter a plea of not guilty, or setting aside the verdict of guilty, or dismissing the accusation, information, or indictment."

8. California Code of Regulations, Title 16, section 1399.370, states:

"For the purposes of denial, suspension, or revocation of a license, a crime or act shall be considered to be substantially related to the qualifications, functions or duties of a respiratory care practitioner, if it evidences present or potential unfitness of a licensee to perform the functions authorized by his or her license or in a manner inconsistent with the public health, safety, or welfare. Such crimes or acts shall include but not be limited to those involving the following:

" . . .

"(b) Conviction of a crime involving fiscal dishonesty theft, or larceny.

" "

## COST RECOVERY

9. Section 3753.5, subdivision (a) of the Code states:

"In any order issued in resolution of a disciplinary proceeding before the board, the board or the administrative law judge may direct any practitioner or applicant found to have committed a violation or violations of law to pay to the board a sum not to exceed the costs of the investigation and prosecution of the case."

10. Section 3753.7 of the Code states:

"For purposes of the Respiratory Care Practice Act, costs of prosecution shall include attorney general or other prosecuting attorney fees, expert witness fees, and other administrative, filing, and service fees."

11. Section 3753.1, subdivision (a) of the Code states:

"An administrative disciplinary decision imposing terms of probation may include, among other things, a requirement that the licensee-probationer pay the monetary

costs associated with monitoring the probation."

## FIRST CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Conviction of a Crime)

- 12. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under sections 3750, subdivision (d), and 3752 of the Code, and California Code of Regulations, Title 16, section 1399.370, subdivision (b), in that she was convicted of a crime substantially related to the qualifications, functions or duties of a respiratory care practitioner. The circumstances are as follows:
  - A. On or about April 10, 2006, the security division from United Parcel Services (UPS) contacted the Los Angeles County Deputy Sheriff's Department about Respondent's husband, a UPS employee, who was stealing packages from the Cerritos operations plant, repackaging them, and having them shipped to his residence. On or about April 10, 2006, the UPS security team tracked a package containing numerous stolen items including jewelry, clothes, and prescription narcotic pills valued at about \$7,000.00, which was delivered to Respondent's residence. A search warrant was issued, and the deputy sheriffs entered Respondent's residence. Respondent's husband admitted that over the prior fifteen months, he had sent about ten packages of stolen repackaged items from UPS, including computers, jewelry, gift cards, and thousands of prescription narcotic pills, to his residence in Respondent's name. Respondent admitted to receiving the package on April 10, 2006, and also admitted receiving another package in or around December 2005. She stated that she knew the items were probably stolen. Respondent and her husband were arrested for grand theft.
  - B. On or about November 27, 2006, in Los Angeles County Superior Court Complaint No. VA095763, Respondent was charged with grand theft by embezzlement, in violation of Penal Code section 487, subdivision (a), a felony (Count 1); receiving stolen property, in violation of Penal Code section 496, subdivision (a), a felony (Count 2); possession for sale of a controlled substance, Codeine and Hydrocodone, in violation of Health and Safety Code section 11351, a felony (Count 3); possession for sale of a

2
 3

controlled substance, Temazepam and Alprazolam, in violation of Health and Safety Code section 11378, a felony (Count 4); and possession for sale of a controlled substance, Phentermine and Phendizatrazine, in violation of Health and Safety Code section 11378, a felony (Count 5).

C. On or about May 10, 2007, Respondent was convicted upon her plea of nolo contendere to grand theft by embezzlement (Count 1). On or about May 25, 2007, Respondent was placed on probation for three years with terms and conditions including: serve 180 days in county jail (with credit for 1 day); pay a court security assessment of \$20.00 and a restitution fine of \$200.00; not to possess or own any dangerous or deadly weapons; not to use or possess any narcotics or dangerous drugs; and make restitution to the victim. Counts 2 through 5 of the complaint were dismissed.

## SECOND CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Commission of a Fraudulent, Dishonest or Corrupt Act)

- 13. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under section 3750, subdivision (j), of the Code, in that she committed a fraudulent, dishonest or corrupt act substantially related to the qualifications, functions, or duties of a respiratory care practitioner.
  - A. The facts and circumstances set forth in above Paragraph 12 of this Accusation are incorporated herein by reference.
  - B. On her respiratory care practitioner license renewal application, Respondent answered "No" to the question regarding whether since she last renewed her license, she had been convicted of, diverted for, or pled guilty or nolo contendere/no contest to any violation of any law. On or about May 1, 2008, Respondent signed the license renewal application declaring under penalty of perjury that the information on the application was true and correct. She thereafter submitted the license renewal application to the Board. As Respondent was well aware at the time she signed this license renewal application, her answer was false by virtue of her conviction as set forth in Paragraph 12 above.

<u>PRAYER</u>	
WHEREFORE, Complainant requests that a hearing be held on the matters herein	
alleged, and that following the hearing, the Respiratory Care Board issue a decision:	
Revoking or suspending Respiratory Care Practitioner License Number	
19360 issued to Karen Louise Parker;	
2. Ordering Karen Louise Parker to pay the Respiratory Care Board the costs	
of the investigation and enforcement of this case, and if placed on probation, the costs of	
probation monitoring; and	
3. Taking such other and further action as deemed necessary and proper.	
DATED: <u>December 22, 2008</u>	
Original signed by Liona 7immannan farr	
Original signed by Liane Zimmerman for: STEPHANIE NUNEZ Executive Officer	
Respiratory Care Board of California	
Department of Consumer Affairs State of California	
Complainant	